THE
Dan Smoot Report

Vol. 16, No. 40 (Broadcast 789) October 5, 1970 Dallas, Texas

DAN SMOOT

MORE ARMS FOR MORE PEACE

The worldwide traffic in conventional arms since World War II is estimated at about $66 billion. The United States has supplied about $50 billion of the total — in *direct* military assistance or armaments sales.(1)

The American weapons, which have gone to most nations on earth since World War II, range from handguns to jet aircraft. They include major U.S. warships lent to foreign nations. The most recent information available indicates that we now have 75 such ships on loan to 17 nations.(1)

In 1955, the Soviets began a program of supplying arms to other nations, claiming, of course, that the program was necessary to counter U.S. activities.(1)

Before President Eisenhower left office, influential members of the Council on Foreign Relations (some of them important figures in the Eisenhower administration) began laying plans for unilateral disarmament of the United States. Many of these disarmament planners were given key positions in the Kennedy administration in 1961. President Kennedy proposed and Congress authorized the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. This made *official* policy of the Council on Foreign Relation's drive to disarm the U.S. and surrender to the United Nations control over U.S. strategic weapons.(2) At the same time, Kennedy's administration sharply accelerated the program of supplying other nations with U.S. weapons. In 1961 — while still giving away armaments abroad and lending warships — our government started emphasizing *selling* our armaments to other nations, usually on credit underwritten by American taxpayers through the Export-Import Bank or through a loan-guarantee program administered by the Department of Defense.(1)

In recent years, industrialized nations of Europe began exporting arms in significant quantities. Just as the Soviets claimed they started exporting arms because of what we were doing, so our European allies claim they were drawn into the armaments-export market to counter America's aggressive activi-

THE DAN SMOOT REPORT is published weekly by The Dan Smoot Report, Inc., Box 9538, Dallas, Texas 75214 (office at 6441 Gaston Ave.). Subscriptions: $22.00 for 2 years; $12.00, 1 year; $7.00 6 months. Dan Smoot was born in Missouri, reared in Texas. With BA and MA degrees from SMU (1938 and 1940), he joined the Harvard faculty (1941) as a Teaching Fellow, doing graduate work in American civilization. From 1942 to 1951, he was an FBI agent; from 1951 to 1955, a commentator on national radio and television. In 1955, he started his present independent, free-enterprise business: publishing this REPORT and abbreviating it each week for radio and TV broadcasts available for commercial sponsorship by business firms.

Copyright by Dan Smoot, 1970. Second Class mail privilege authorized at Dallas, Texas.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ties in this field during the Kennedy and Johnson administrations.[1]

The estimate that the U.S. has *directly* put $50 billion worth of armaments into the worldwide traffic since World War II seems reliable; but we have no idea how much international armaments trafficking has been financed *indirectly* with our tax dollars.

Since 1946, the net amount of aid we have given to Great Britain (United Kingdom) totals $7.5 billion; to France, $7 billion; to Sweden, $144.7 million; to Italy, $5.3 billion; to Belgium, $1.7 billion; to West Germany, $3.7 billion; to Czechoslovakia, $189.5 million. These are the seven nations specified as the largest European exporters of arms in recent years. Our net aid to these seven nations since 1946 totals $25.5 billion.[3] Obviously, American tax dollars given to these nations helped finance their arms-exporting to some degree.

We do not know how much of our tax money, given to non-industrial foreign nations as economic aid, has been diverted by them into armaments purchases from other nations.

We do not know how much of the 20-billion-dollars worth of food stuffs we have given to other nations since 1954 has been used by those nations for armaments traffic with other nations. For example, since 1946, we have given communist Poland $446.4 million in aid. A great deal of that amount represents wheat shipped since 1954 under Public Law 480. In recent years, we have known that, as ships were unloading American gift-wheat-for-Poland in a Polish harbor, other ships were being loaded in the same harbor with Polish goods for communist North Vietnam. How much of this Polish-North Vietnam trade was financed with American gift-wheat? How much of the trade involved Soviet and Czechoslovakian weapons that Poland acquired in barter deals with our wheat? We have no way of knowing, or even of making a meaningful estimate.

What has been the U.S. purpose in supplying arms to other nations? Ostensibly, we were trying to accomplish four major objectives: (1) give other nations the wherewithal to defend themselves against communism; (2) bind other nations to us as allies who would have the means and desire to help us if we became embroiled in war with communists; (3) save American taxpayers money — the assumption being that we have an inescapable duty to defend other nations and that such defense will be cheaper for us if we arm them to defend themselves than if we defend them with our own troops; (4) promote world peace — the assumption being that if each nation is adequately prepared to defend itself, would-be aggressors will be discouraged from attempting aggression.

Since 1946, the net amount of aid we have given the Republic of China is just under $5 billion. A considerable portion of that was military assistance to fight communism, *before* communists conquered mainland China. While giving Chiang Kai-shek aid to fight communism, however, our government was pursuing policies which made Chiang's success impossible. The countless millions of mainland Chinese were clamorous with gratitude and admiration for the United States on that day in 1945 when Japan surrendered. Four years later, communists controlled mainland China; and the countless millions of China today are seething with hatred of the United States.

Somewhat comparable, though less dramatic and important, stories can be told of other countries which have received our aid to resist communism.

Some, but not all, of our $189.5 million in aid to Czechoslovakia was given before communists formally took the country over in 1948.

Some, but not all, of our $43.8 million in aid to Cuba was given before communists took the country over in 1959.

In the late 1940's and early 1950's, we gave France $1.5 billion to help her fight communism in the colonial possessions known before 1954 as French Indochina, comprising the area now known as Cambodia, Laos, North Vietnam, and South Vietnam.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Since 1946, we have given Chile $1.4 billion. This year, the people of Chile elected a communist to be their President.

The listing of examples could be continued; but the point does not need laboring: our foreign aid has not made other nations successful in resisting communism.

Yet, Lieutenant General Robert H. Warren (Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for military assistance sales) is still saying what foreign aid officials have been saying since 1946:

"The armed forces we . . . help to support represent an extension of our own defensive posture and a major deterrent to communist aggression."[1]

Our foreign aid has not accomplished its objective of creating allies with the means and desire to help *us* fight communists. In Korea, the only nation that gave us substantial help was South Korea itself. Aid from other nations receiving our aid was token or non-existent — mostly non-existent. Chiang Kai-shek offered to help, but we would not let him. Indeed, President Truman stationed a fleet in China waters to prevent Chiang from fighting the mainland Chinese whom we were fighting in Korea.

In Vietnam, we have also refused Chiang's offer to help. We have paid a few other nations (like Thailand) to give us token assistance; but most of the more-than-one-hundred nations to whom we have given aid to help fight communism have been against us in the Vietnam war. Nations that have received the most American aid (Great Britain, for example) have helped communist North Vietnam by shipping supplies to her while we have been fighting her.

Melvin Laird, Secretary of Defense, says:

"A MAP [military aid program] dollar is of far greater value than a dollar spent directly on U.S. forces."[1]

That argument was used endlessly by President Eisenhower and all other foreign-aid advocates during the Eisenhower administration: spending American taxpayers' money for military assistance to other nations saves American taxpayers' money because it is cheaper for us to equip others to fight than for us to do the fighting. Ignoring the false assumption that our government has a duty or right to defend other nations, let us examine this claim that giving aid to other nations is the cheapest way to combat the threat of communism.

Since 1946, direct foreign aid (which does not include many outlays of our tax money intended to help other nations but not classified as foreign aid) has cost U.S. taxpayers $199.4 billion.[2] In 1950, our own defense budget was $13 billion. In the past three fiscal years, our defense budget has averaged $78 billion annually.

Communism has engulfed more than a billion people in more than 20 nations since the beginning of this postwar tidal wave of American spending to stop the spread of communism. Relative to the military power of communist nations, American military power is infinitely weaker today than it was when our government set out on the announced course of making us and our allies militarily strong enough to resist communism. Communist *military might* was no threat whatever to the American homeland in 1946. Today, the threat is awesome. If we continue neglecting our homeland defense, the Soviets will soon have the capacity to destroy us.

Has our program of worldwide distribution of armaments promoted world peace? Since the program began, American weapons have been used in more than 50 wars[1] — two of them (Korea and Vietnam) *major* wars by any standard of measurement. In some of the more-than-fifty wars which have occurred since we started exporting arms to stop wars, our weapons were used by both sides. One notable example is the India-Pakistan war of the early 1960's. Both sides used our weapons. Each side hated us for helping the other side. India moved even closer to communism than she already was. Pakistan, believed to be one of America's staunchest friends in Asia, denounced us and embraced communist China.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Congressional liberals (including those like Senators J. William Fulbright, Charles Goodell, and George McGovern, whom Spiro Agnew now calls radical liberals and neo-isolationists) were staunch supporters of our foreign aid programs from the beginning. None seemed concerned that our military assistance was financing wars all over the earth — until the Arab-Israeli war of 1967. Not only were the Israelis using all kinds of American weapons in that war, but so were the Arabs. Our foreign military assistance program became a controversial issue in Congress.[1]

The Export-Import Bank's participation in the financing of sales of armaments to foreign nations was stopped; the Pentagon's loan-guarantee program was terminated; and other restrictions were imposed on the sales and gifts of American arms abroad.[1]

But in 1968, President Johnson proposed a *new* $296-million-a-year sales-and-credit-guarantee program "to continue the U.S. financing of arms sales necessary for the defense of friendly less-developed countries." With little debate, Congress approved.[1]

In 1969, Congress did not appropriate new funds for the program. This year, President Nixon's request for new funds was stalled by Senate "doves" writing into the appropriation bill the Cooper-Church amendment prohibiting use of funds to support U.S. troops in Cambodia.

Now, before Congress has completed action on foreign-aid appropriations bills for the current fiscal year, President Nixon has proposed what he calls a "fresh and exciting" new foreign aid program for Congress to consider next year.[1,4]

And what is a major emphasis in the President's "fresh and exciting" new program? Why, increased foreign military assistance to accomplish four major objectives: (1) give other nations the wherewithal to defend themselves; (2) bind them to us as allies; (3) save American taxpayers' money; (4) promote world peace![1,5]

NEXT WEEK: More on foreign aid

FOOTNOTES

(1) *Congressional Quarterly Weekly Report*, March 6, 1970, pp. 698-701

(2) *Dan Smoot Report*, 1961 Bound Volume, pp. 313-320, 330-331, 345, 396; 1962 Bound Volume, pp. 97-104; 1963 Bound Volume, pp. 137-160

(3) "Total Net Foreign Assistance to 123 Nations and 7 Territories of the World, Fiscal Years 1946 through 1970," a statistical report prepared and issued by Congressman Otto E. Passman, Chairman of the Foreign Operations Subcommittee on Appropriations, July 1, 1970

(4) *Congressional Quarterly Weekly Report*, March 13, 1970, pp. 762-763

(5) "Foreign Assistance For The Seventies," President's message to Congress, Sept. 5, 1970

STATEMENT REQUIRED BY LAW FOR THE DAN SMOOT REPORT, 6441 Gaston Avenue, Dallas, Texas 75214, owned and published weekly by the Dan Smoot Report, Inc., edited and managed by Dan Smoot, who owns more than 99% of the corporation's stock, there being no bondholders, mortgagees, or other security holders.

The average number of copies printed each week during the preceding 12 months: 20,600; of the single issue nearest October 1, 1970: 22,000. Average number of weekly subscription sales during preceding 12 months: 12,200; of the single issue nearest October 1, 1970: 11,628. Average weekly sales by means other than subscription during the preceding 12 months: 2,600; of the single issue nearest October 1, 1970: 7,000. Average paid weekly circulation during preceding 12 months: 14,800; of the single issue nearest October 1, 1970: 18,628. There is no free distribution. Average total weekly distribution during preceding 12 months: 14,800; of the single issue nearest October 1, 1970: 18,628. Average number of copies retained weekly for office use during preceding 12 months: 5,800; of the single issue nearest October 1, 1970: 3,372.

Subscribe Today to The Dan Smoot Report

6 mos. $7.00 **– 1 YR. $12.00 –** 2 yrs. $22.00

THE DAN SMOOT REPORT
BOX 9538, DALLAS, TEXAS 75214
Telephone: TAylor 1-2303

Send reprints to your friends and suggest they order reprints too.
REPRINTS OF THIS ISSUE (for bulk mailing to one address):

1 copy	$ .25	50 copies	$ 5.50
6 copies	1.00	100 copies	10.00
25 copies	3.50	1000 copies	90.00

Texans Add 4¼% for Sales Tax
(Add 50c for special-handling postage)

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED